DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 479 697 SO 035 290

AUTHOR	Hildreth, R. W.
TITLE	The "Lived Experience" of Political Engagement.
PUB DATE	2003-08-00
NOTE	36p.; Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association (99th, Philadelphia, PA, August 28-31, 2003).
PUB TYPE	Reports - Research (143) -- Speeches/Meeting Papers (150)
EDRS PRICE	EDRS Price MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS	*Citizenship Education; *Experiential Learning; Higher Education; Interviews; Models; Political Science; Practicums; Qualitative Research; *Student Experience; *Student Participation
IDENTIFIERS	Interpretive Research; *Political Action; Thick Description Method; University of Minnesota

ABSTRACT

For faculty members who incorporate experiential or service learning pedagogies into their courses, student experiences in the field can be difficult, emotionally charged, and full of unexpected outcomes. This paper presents the findings from a qualitative study of student lived experiences in the political science course "Democracy and Education" (an upper level political theory course at the University of Minnesota (Minneapolis) and practicum "Coaching Public Achievement." The paper has two distinct goals: (1) to describe the course and practicum as a potential model for instructors who wish to incorporate similar pedagogies and practical experiences into their courses; and (2) to better understand the nature of student experiences, what these experiences mean, how they learn through experience, and whether this course fosters political engagement. It explains that, based on narratives from in-depth interviews and student journals, the interpretive study aims at what Clifford Geertz calls thick description. The study seeks to document learning and personal change through critical analysis of detailed narratives. The paper concludes with a discussion of the findings--narrative descriptions of student experiences highlight the profound learning that occurred through the course. It offers a broad working definition of political engagement, encompassing an individual's involvement in formal and informal activities with others intended to influence or address public problems. Includes six notes. Contains 29 references (BT)

Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made
from the original document.

ED 479 697

THE "LIVED EXPERIENCE" OF POLITICAL ENGAGEMENT

SO 035 290

R.W. Hildreth, Ph.D. (cand.)
Department of Political Science
University of Minnesota
1414 Social Science Building
Minneapolis, MN 55455

hildreth@polisci.umn.edu

Prepared for delivery at the 2003 Annual Meeting of the American Political Science Association, August 28 - August 31, 2003.
Copyright by the American Political Science Association.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

R.W. Hildreth

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☒ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

> I don't like Public Achievement. I think it's another way to indoctrinate kids and to trick them into thinking they have a lot of power when, in fact, they don't. Nothing about it is revolutionary because even if the sessions themselves are radical, there's no space for it to extend past the sessions. It's difficult to do radical work if you're in the confines of a classroom, especially a Roman Catholic classroom. There's no support system for kids to feel like they're doing great things because PA ingrains in you the notion that if you don't complete a project, you have not done PA. I'm sorry, but I feel like PA was just a big hindrance to our group.
>
> So many rules! Yes, I realize that the rules and procedural issues were on St. Bernard's behalf, but what's so democratic about working in a school that doesn't promote democratic values? This experience has really confirmed my belief that true democratic action can only happen on the streets, not within mainstream institutions. Overall, I really enjoyed being part of PA because of the relationships and the learning experiences I extracted from it, but I wish PA would have really lived up to its philosophy.
>
> *Elaine*, Democracy and Education Student[1]

This quote is atypical, but instructive. It is atypical of opening quotes found in many articles about civic engagement programs, which tend to be positive. It is atypical of other students' evaluations; many agreed with Elaine about the challenges of Public Achievement (PA), but came to different conclusions about its theory and practice. And it is atypical of the student. Elaine often commented in class, reflection sessions and interviews about the challenges and difficulties she was having, but she alwaysexpressed a positive attitude towards her work with young people. The quote is also instructive. It is instructive in showing that Elaine learned through her experience. Elaine makes a convincing critical assessment of PA based on a theoretical conception about the nature of "radical democratic" action. She arrived at this idea of democratic action by placing her understanding of PublicA chievement in conversation with her own life experience. The quote also reveals the frustrations that come when the excitement and promise of democratic action runs up against the realities of working in specific institutional settings. It also makes glaringly apparent how I, the instructor, could have been more attentive to this students' particular struggles as well as better prepared the class for the realities of working in schools. Finally, for faculty members that incorporate experiential or

service-learning pedagogies into their courses, this passage confirms that students' experiences "in the field" can be difficult, emotionally charged, and full of unexpected outcomes. This means that we not only have to prepare students for the unexpected, but prepare ourselves to hear and act upon criticisms such as Elaine's.

In this paper, I present the findings from a study of students' "lived experiences" in the political science course "Democracy and Education" and practicum "Coaching Public Achievement." "Democracy and Education" is an upper level political theory course at the University of Minnesota. On Tuesdays students attend a seminar, discussing some of the major texts in political theory that address the relationship between democracy and education. On Thursdays, students "put their theory into practice" by serving as "coaches" (experiential educators) for teams of young people who are designing and carrying out their own political action projects as part of Public Achievement. The study used qualitative methods to better analyze the complexities of students' experiences and the learning that occurred through their experiences.

This paper has two distinct goals. The first goal is to describe the course and practicum as a potential model for instructors who wish to incorporate similar pedagogies and practical experiences into their courses. The second goal is to better understand the nature of students' experiences, what these experiences mean, how they learn through experience, and whether this course fosters political engagement. Based on narratives from in-depth interviews and student journals, this interpretive study aims at what Geertz (1971) calls thick description. While not a causal analysis, the study seeks to document learning and personal change through critical analysis of detailed narratives. I conclude the paper with a discussion of the findings Narrative descriptions of students' experiences highlight the profound learning that occurred through the

course. As a theorist of democratic practice, I am interested in **how** particular democratic experiences promote learning and engagement. In this case, the course and practicum engage students in democratic practice, and in the process, invite students to reflexively consider who they are as students, coaches, and citizens.

The paper will be organized as follows. After briefly defining some key terms in the study, the second section describes the course and practicum. The third section briefly outlines research methods. The fourth section presents key findings. This section is divided into four parts which detail: A.) experiences in the course, B.) experiences in the practicum, C.) narratives of learning about politics, D.) narratives of personal change and political engagement. The final section presents my discussion of the findings.

Although this study does not operationalize concepts as variables, it is important to clarify the concepts that I use. I offer a broad working definition of "political engagement," encompassing an individual's involvement in formal and informal activities with others intended to influence or address public problems (this definition draws from Barber 1984; Boyte and Kari 1996). Moreover, the study is open-ended: it asks students to personally define politics and to consider how their experiences in the course and practicum are examples of political engagement. My working definition of experience is the interaction between and individual and what constitutes her environment at the time (social, physical, or intellectual) (Dewey 1997). Experience is therefore situated in and over time as well as what Etienne Wenger calls a "community of practice" (Wenger 1998).

II. Descriptions of the Course / Program

The Course

"Democracy and Education" is an upper-level political theory course at the University of Minnesota (for syllabus, see Appendix A). This semester length course attracts approximately 20 students and meets one day per week. James Farr first developed the course in 1992, and has been continually developing itever since. This past year, I was given the opportunity to teach the class while Farr was on sabbatical (having assisted Professor Farr with the course and worked independently for Public Achievement for six years). Organized as a seminar, the course focuses on the critical reading and discussion of major texts in political theory that investigate theoretical, practical, and political dimensions of the relationship between democracy and education. There were two related themes to the course. The first focused on "major texts" in political and educational theory, including John Dewey, Myles Horton & Paulo Freire, C. Douglas Lummis, and Hannah Arendt. The initial weeks involved readings to acquaint students with fundamental concepts of citizenship, democracy, and power. The second theme focused on more practical and contemporary issues surrounding education, with readings from Jonathan Kozol, E.D. Hirsch, Lisa Delpit and others. Taken as a whole, the texts can be understood in general as being **about** political education and democracy, as well as actually attempting **to** politically educate their audiences for an active democratic life. While the two themes were sequentially ordered, the discussions and writings were always oriented toward the dialectic between theory and practice.[2] The writing assignments reflected this dialectic. They included weekly reflection papers on the reading, practicum experience, and connections between the two; a problem-solving research project, and a final exam that asked students to synthesize readings and practicum experiences in order to come up with their own concept of democratic education.

The course itself was intentionally structured on democratic principles. Students were given the power to make certain decisions as to how the course was organized and taught. They could determine the methods of instruction (lecture, discussion, peer-teaching), how they were graded (self-grade, peer-grade, instructor grade, a combination, etc.), and regularlyevaluat e the course (at the end of every session and through a mid-year written evaluation). Obviously, the course was not "fully" democratic; I still determined the readings, assignments, and general structure.[3] I tried to open up some decisions and control to the students as a learning opportunity. As a result, the class became both an object of analysis and a collective political project. As such, the class attempted to make explicit the ways in which democracy can (and cannot) function in the classroom, in order to model a mode of democratic practice that students could draw from in their role as coaches.

The Practicum

The course includes an integrated year-long practicum where students serve as "coaches" in Public Achievement– an experiential civic education program. On Thursdays, undergraduates would travel to a St. Bernard's, a K-12 Catholic school in St. Paul, Minnesota to work with teams of young people who are designing and carrying out their own political action projects. Public Achievement was developed by the University of Minnesota's Center for Democracy and Citizenship. It is based on the concept of "public work," which is defined by Harry Boyte and James Farr as the "expenditure of visible efforts by ordinary citizens whose collective labor produces things or create processes of lasting civic value" (1997, 42).[4] Public work envisions democracy as the "work of the people." Accordingly, citizenship is viewed in terms of being a co-creator of the public world, in contrast to being a consumer, client, or volunteer (Boyte and

Kari 1996). Public Achievement programs currently operate in seven states, and internationally in Northern Ireland, Turkey and Palestine.

For the undergraduates in my class, Public Achievement is different from many service-learning approaches in political science. Instead, of just working for non-profits, Public Achievement coaches are experiential educators: they take part in an intentional effort to educate young citizens as they devise and carry out projects in the "real world" that are designed to make a positive public impact. In addition to teaching young people about citizenship and political action, the experience is intentionally structured as a way for undergraduates to learn about themselves as citizens (Farr 1997).

But here is the hitch! It is the young people who "drive" Public Achievement. Coaches are there to facilitate, guide and to help students learn through their projects (i.e. not to direct or do work for students). Young people choose the issues they want to work on and are placed in teams with four to ten others who chose the same issue. Because issues are tied to young people's interests, they range from school-based (changing school rules, multi-cultural education programs) to neighborhood (helping the homeless, preventing gangs, cleaning up the community) to global (protesting the war in Iraq, world hunger, child labor).

Rather than following a rigidly prescribed method, Public Achievement encourages young people to develop their own means for solving public problems. As Dewey (1916, 1997) recommends, groups start from "scratch" in the sense that they have to begin with where they are, what their interests are, and what they know about the issue. From this starting point, the coaches guide the young people through an open framework for public action. The Public Achievement framework is based on techniques developed through community organizing effortsand from the citizenship schools of the civil rights movement (Hildreth 1998; Evans and

Boyte 1986). First, coaches are asked to co-create with team members a democratic group, where everyone participates in making decisions, contributes according to their abilities, and works together on common goals. Second, group members research their issues and the socio-political contexts surrounding those issues. They then "power map" the issue by identifying stakeholders and the relations of power and interest between and among stakeholders. Based on this information, young people come up with an action plan for a project that will make an impact within a given time frame (in this case, an academic year). Through evaluation and "teachable moments," coaches help young people learn what it means to take action in the world, to be aware of one's actions, to "fail," and to "succeed." (Hildreth 1998, 2000). By helping their groups learn and use a vocabulary of public work (including concepts such as "democracy," "citizenship," "power," "interests," "diversity," and "public") to name what they are learning, coaches provide conceptual tools and frames that young people can use to define their concerns as public issues, and to think about the world in new ways (Farr 1997). In sum, coaching involves a complex balancing act of helping the group 1) learn how to work together, 2) devise and carry out a political action project, and 3) learn through the process.

Like the school children, undergraduate coaches also work as a team. Before beginning coaching, undergraduates go through approximately 10 hours of training and orientation to Public Achievement and St. Bernard's School. More importantly than this formal training, coaches participate together in weekly de-briefings after each coaching session. The coaches gather as a group to reflect on their experiences and cooperatively problem-solve. This reflection time provides a valuable source of training, as coaches serve as resources for their classmates. It also helps to integrate the practical work of coaching with the overall class material.

III. Research Methods

> It's hard because in some way I think the skills that come out of a situation like this are just difficult to define. Not even to define, but they're difficult to see because it's not like one day I learned this specifically and now I can do that specifically. It's more through the 12 weeks, I learned tiny little idiosyncrasies of how to work with these kids and now I feel much more competent, but there wasn't like a drastic turning point.
>
> *Isaac,* Democracy and Education Student

This quote captures one of the important realities about the learning that occurs in experientially based civic or political education efforts. Much of the learning that comes from working with community members is difficult to name because it is situational, emergent, and co-creative (for a discussion of this form of learning, see Wenger 1998). Yet, it is this subtle and often messy work on "real" issues with community members that students find exciting and meaningful. This ambiguity presents real difficulties to researchers who seek to assess and measure academic and political engagement outcomes. Thankfully, there have been important gains in the research on civic engagement and service-learning over the past ten years documenting **what** students learn (for a review, see Billig, 2000). Research has shown that service-learning, when properly implemented, enhances academic learning and may foster political and civic engagement (e.g. Markus et al 1993; Giles and Eyler 1997; Waterman 1997; Hepburn 2000; see also Niemi and Junn 1998). Typically, this research tends to categorize learning into knowledge, attitudes, skills, and dispositions (Patrick 2000). While these are important findings for both research and practice (they offer proof to skeptical colleagues that these pedagogies are academically rigorous), I always have the sense that this research misses something; it misses the subtlety and richness of experience, it misses the **how** of learning. This

study uses qualitative methods in order to examine the "how" of experiential learning. As such, these methods are intended to compliment and extend dominant techniques and measures.

This research project employed multiple instruments including surveys, student journals, and in-depth group and individual interviews. For background information, students in the class took a modified version of the "Civic Engagement Knowledge Networks Survey" (Keeter, et al 2002). The main purpose of the survey was to get a "snap-shot" of what types of students the course attracted, and to examine the degree to which they were already politically engaged. Out of the twenty students in the course, twelve volunteered to take part in the study. Out of those twelve, ten completed the survey (return rate 83%), eleven volunteered to be interviewed, and six submitted their student journals. All students in the course also filled out information cards where they specified why they were taking the course as well as their major.

Student journals (Thought-books) were a weekly class assignment where students recorded their reflections on the course, practicum and politics in general. At the end of the year, students had the option of submitting their journals to be part of the study. The main purpose of the journals was to provide additional documentation of the development and trajectory of learning experiences over the course of the year, and serve as a validity check for the interviews.

The central instruments in the study were in-depth individual and group interviews. I employed external researchers to conduct interviews so that students could be (more) honest about the class as well as to prevent the inherent asymmetrical power relationships present when instructors study their own courses. Interviewers used hermeneutic-phenomenological methods to systematically ask participants to describe their "lived experiences" of being in this class and practicum (Kvale 1996; van Manen 1990; Stewart and Mickunas, 1990). Phenomenological interviews are open-ended and conversational, with an emphasis on careful listening to the

respondents' descriptions of experiences (Kvale 1996, 19). Through attentive listening, interviewers re-frame respondents' answers back and ask for more details about particular facets of experience.

Students were interviewed twice for 60-90 minutes. The first round of interviews was conducted in small groups (2-3) at the end of the first semester. These interviews asked students about their experiences in the course and the context of coaching Public Achievement. Group interviews allowed students to put their different perspectives into conversation (sometimes to disagree) in order to establish the context of the course and practicum. At the end of the second semester, students were interviewed individually.

The interviews were semi-structured in terms of four levels of questioning/listening to hear "changes" that result from experience (See Appendix B). The first levelasked stu dents for detailed descriptions of their experiences participating in the class and Public Achievement. The second level asked students to name what they had learned (e.g. skills, knowledge, and self-understanding). The third level asked whether students transferred or "tried out" what they had learned in different domains of their lives. The fourth level asked students "if they are different" because of this experience, especially in terms of political engagement. On each level, students were asked to reflect on what these experiences mean to them. The emphasis on "lived experience" provides the reference point to explore how students' thinking about and engagement in politics have changed. We ask students to connect self-reported changes to their detailed descriptions of experiences. By paying careful attention to the details of experience, narrative, and language frames, we can hear "change" and test face validity.

The interviews were taped and transcribed. The transcripts and journals were analyzed thematically and in terms of narrative. Thematic analysis involves identifying the outstanding

experiences and metaphors that were common across interviews (Kvale 1996). To check the validity of my identification of themes, the two interviewers also read the transcripts and identified themes. The transcripts were read again, this time examining how the themes fit into the larger structure of the interviews. Narrative analysis examines the particularities of individual stories (Clandinin and Connelly 2000; Polkinghorne 1988). It examines the development of experiences over time, in context, and in relation to the subjects' biography. Through both of these methods of analysis, we developed an inventory of the most salient facets of experience that contributed to learning and personal change.

IV. Study Findings

The discussion of findings is divided into four sections. Each section highlights several important findings within a specific domain of experience. The first and second sections focus on descriptions of students' "lived experiences" in the classroom and as coaches, respectively. The third and fourth sections focus on learning and personal change. The third section presents findings on what students learned **about** politics through the course and practicum. The fourth section details narratives of personal change, specificallyhow students **became** more politically engaged as a result of their experience.

Before turning to the findings from the interviews, I will briefly highlight findings from the survey and student information cards. The survey revealed that politically active students indeed "self-selected" the course. Of those eligible, 87% voted in the last election. One-half said that they followed politics in the news very closely, with the remaining 50% following politics somewhat closely. Seven in ten have participated in volunteer or community service in the last twelve months and 90% have volunteered at some point in their lives. Based on "first

day information cards," reasons for taking the course included: fulfill requirements (15%), fit their time schedule (20%), the number of credits (25%), and thought it looked interesting (40%). Most students (70%) were political science majors. Based on my somewhat subjective evaluation of student writing and class discussion, the survey confirmed my impression that many of the students in the course were already politically engaged; however, their activism spanned the political spectrum from left to right.

A. The Lived Experience of a Democratic Classroom

Interviewer:	A lot of it's true in every class, that it takes a while to get used to people, it takes a while to get used to the instructor…Was there anything particularly different in this class that was a more embodied invitation to participate, or anything like that?
Andrew:	Well, if nothing else, the [way the instructor asks] questions…I think about [more than] any other class that I've had. I actually felt like my opinions were valued.
Clarissa:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	Huh! That is really weird.
	(laughter)
Bob:	I think the stuff that we're looking at, kind of analyzing education….while getting educated. So we're kind of like, thinking, like standing outside the boxes…so I think it offered a new dynamic that way.
Interviewer:	So it was sort of a meta-reflection, reflecting on your own reflections.
Clarissa:	I think from the start he just really challenged us to be a little more open and to speak and to share our ideas. I think that he said that the first day of class. You know, and that helped to start it off. And when you have that invitation right from the start, it makes the process, I think, go a lot faster.
Interviewer:	Ok. So, one dimension is speed, the second one could be depth. Was it deeper experience in his class than in other classes?
Andrew:	This class is much more engaging than most, most of the time the subject material is presented in a straightforward fashion; you give the required answer, little of it stays with you. In this class you feel like not only are you discussing the subject matter, but your actually kind of living it, if that makes any sense.
Interviewer:	That makes good sense.

Bob:	Yeah, he [the instructor] did a good job of like making us, make it relational to our life.
Clarissa:	Right.
Interviewer:	So you come to embody what you're talking about.
All:	Yeah.
Interviewer:	So it becomes sort of an existential thing. That its there, and it's life, and that you're living the experience being discussed. That can be powerful.
Clarissa:	But I also think living it gave us a way of critiquing, and looking at the stuff we read and the theory, and the things we discussed. And when you live it you see more of the practicality, and those kinds of aspects...

This interview conversation exemplifies many of the important themes about the course found across all the interviews. In this section, I will elaborate on three key ways that students experienced the course: as open, as democratic, and as shifting theoretical ground. Taken together, these three themes capture the sense that students were not only studying about democracy and education, but were living democratic education.

Andrew's statement that "my opinions were valued" reflects the first theme: the class as an "open" space and place where students could express themselves and be heard. The students named moments and experiences where openness showed itself. Most talked about how the instructor asked questions in ways that invited all students to contribute. Jasmine commented, "He knows how to ask questions...He is so good at synthesizing everybody's opinions, and saying, well, 'let me see if I've got this straight,' and he puts it in such easy terms to chew, that, anybody [can learn], like Political Science for dummies." Students also thought that the high level of debate and dialogue in the class was another way that this quality of "openness" manifested itself. Several other students remarked that the class was characterized by many different voices, not "the usual ones who talk all the time [that] you kind of tune out."

The second and related theme involves the newness of participating in a democratic classroom. For many students, this was their first experience of being in a course based on democratic principles. As stated before, the three areas of the course that were opened up to democratic decision making were grading procedures, instructional methods, and regular evaluation. Regular evaluations reinforced the first theme of openness, as student input became formal part of the lived reality of the course. The following exchange is illustrative:

> Derek: And actually I'm in one of those classes this semester. And there's just nothing I can do. I'm afraid to bring stuff up, to criticize the class. [The professor] doesn't say explicitly that I'm not going to allow dissent in this class, but it's like when he asks us a stupid question, and I want to say that's a ridiculous question, that's stupid, I just don't feel like I can.
>
> Interviewer: Do you feel like you can do that in this class?
>
> Elaine: Yeah.
>
> Derek: I don't think I could say that's a stupid question, but I could definitely be constructive about it, and say, maybe there's a better way.
>
> Elaine: And I think he made that clear, I think Roudy did a good job making that clear at the beginning of the semester.
>
> Interviewer: Made what clear?
>
> Elaine: You can have dissenting opinion, like I'm not perfect, if you guys think of better ways of doing things, tell me. I think our opinion was always valued.

Nonetheless, the interviews revealed that the students did not feel comfortable voicing all their criticisms, as they offered important critiques of the class, self-grading, and de-briefing that were not raised in various in-class evaluations.

By far the most memorable democratic experience for students was the process of choosing grading procedures and then actually grading themselves. The students chose the option of a combination self-grade / instructor grade. A common sentiment was that the process of choosing was "interesting" or "weird." Some students expressed excitement at the (first) chance to grade themselves, and were surprised how other students in the class resisted this

alternative. Jasmine's comment was typical, "It was interesting. I've never been given that opportunity before. It's kind of been like you study this, you take a test on this, and this will be your grade at the end. I don't know, I thought it was weird [that we got to make this decision]."

All students found the act of grading themselves difficult. Not only was it difficult to assess their own work (they were given criteria, but did not have any basis for comparison), but this was a morally laden exercise. Jasmine continued, "We had to be honest with ourselves! You know, like it's just so easy, to like yeah, I'm gonna give myself an A, you know like I need an A to, to bring up my GPA. But then, you're stuck, you're stuck with a grading criteria, and you're looking at your paper, and you're just like, this paper is crap." This pressure to be honest with themselves was intensified by the fact that the instructor would also grade their papers. Nonetheless, many students commented that this was a positive learning experience; interviews illustrated how they became more structured writers, better editors and more knowledgeable about the writing process. Most importantly, several students commented that their writing improved on subsequent assignments, which I noticed as well.[4]

The third theme involves the relationship between class readings, classroom activities and practicum activities. The course was designed to include a number of different and sometimes conflicting theoretical perspectives. I emphasized that students carefully and critically read the texts, and put them into conversation with each other and the practical experiences of the class and practicum. All students were highly cognizant of this constant shifting, and some were excited about it intellectually. The following exchange is exemplary:

> Andrew: Well, that's why the different approaches worked well. [That] the living through experience and learning experience … was … the foundation of the class was something that I understood really well. But [Roudy] brought in conflicting view points, so you never got too comfortable in the, just living, experiencing, if that makes any sense.

Interviewer:	It does for me. Let me say it back, see if I got it. You got de-centered constantly.
Andrew:	Yes!
Bob:	I, every week we kind of had a different theory, and I used those, tried to coach, using that theory.
Interviewer:	Cool!
Bob:	So like, you know, if [an author] said students should be leading the discussion, I would do it, even if things went bad . . . I would go through the process of it. Or like if [the instructor] said we should be more authoritative, [I] would come in that day with an iron fist. So that way I was always constantly changing my views on what really indeed works and what doesn't.
Interviewer	Alright. So, can I say it back? You moved you're feet around. That is, each time you tried a theory, you put your feet in a different place. You put your feet inside that theory, and you looked at the world from the point of view of that theory. And when you did it, did the world change? Did the world look differently when you were looking at it when you were here wearing Dewey glasses, versus standing here...
Bob	Oh Yeah!

As Bob indicates, trying out different theories in coaching became one of the more vivid connections between theory, practice, and living citizenship. However, several students commented thatthe theories did not work in practice, or that they saw the limitations of theories for practice. Moreover, some students found that the "contradicting theories" were confusing and made coaching even harder, because they provided no definite foundation to stand on. While all undergraduates agreed that theories did not provide a "blueprint" for practice, some recognized how theory provided a way to make sense of and critique their experiences, other readings, and general political news. Kelly commented that, "this class gives a good tool to think critically about what we learn and read. Like this is the material and these are the concepts you need to know to critique them and to know them."

The experience of being in a democratic classroom and in effect, making the classroom itself an object of analysis, represented an embodied invitation to step outside the typical ways of "doing" student. Changing theoretical perspectives reinforced this by constantly "de-centering"

students. This sense of de centering was magnified when students began coaching Public Achievement.

B. The Lived Experience of Coaching Public Achievement

The lived reality of coaching young people in Public Achievement is fluid, emergent, ambiguous, and above all, difficult. Working democratically with a group of young people presents particular challenges. The main tension is between letting the young people drive the group and being the person who is responsible that the group doesn't drive (too far) off the road. This tension makes the coaching role ambiguous and sometimes contradictory. Coaches commonly describe their experience in terms of frustration, learning, and meaningfulness.

A major frustration was the disjuncture between theory and practice, between the expectations of what is supposed to happen versus what actually happens. This exchange is typical:

Interviewer:	Ok, so tell me about the first day of coaching?
Jasmine:	D-Day, I was thinking about all the philosophy we learned, about you know, about these genius[es], you know, Freire and Horton, and all these people and thinking, what would they do? And then the kids come in, and all those theories go out the door and you're left with these kids.
	(laughter)
Jasmine:	And you know, you're trying to do these, these great things, you know, give them all these opportunities. But some of my kids have never been in it before, so they're not used to taking authority and running with it, they're just like what? No. I'm gonna slack off until you punish me...
Interviewer:	So, was the switch from what would Horton do? To why isn't he here, right, now, seeing what I have to go through!
Jasmine:	Exactly!

Most students commented on the experience of being "left with these kids" and not knowing what to do. All the students interviewed demonstrated a keen grasp of the key principles of PA.

They were cognizant of the fact that PA was supposed to be about democratic action, young people exercising power, and learning about themselves in the process. But this rarely worked out in practice. Latricia captures this frustration when she said, "Kids don't go by the script. And you're like, why?" Faced with this dilemma, coaches also turned to the theories we read in class or tried to model my practice in the classroom. Unfortunately the principles, theories, and modeled practice rarely helped them in the early meetings with young people.

When confronted with the situation of being "left with these kids" and not knowing what to do, coaches typically improvised, negotiating in the moment to craft a workable group. This element of reaction and improvisation never went away. Coaches all recalled how their groups could be radically different within a single session, and also from week to week. Latricia confirmed this, "I think it's a varied experience, as well, from time to time. There are ups and downs as the group's behavior and enthusiasm dictates [what happens in the group]. All coaches commented on the important skills of observing, listening and reacting to groups. While group dynamics were a source of frustration, as the year went on most coaches gradually improved their abilities to read, react, and interact with their groups. These coaches found a mediated practice that matched their own group, as opposed to "trying out" a new theory, or an "all encompassing angle" each week. They became in Donald Schön's (1983) phrase, reflective practitioners. Although the process of figuring out this practice was frustrating, it ultimately became a source of considerable learning.

Many undergraduates also found coachingextremely meaningful. Through the constant negotiated interaction with their group, the students and coaches developed authentic relationships with each other– some coaches came to genuinely care about "their kids." Within these relationships, coaches also learned a great deal about and from their students. They learned

about how their students learn, what they care about, how busy they are, and their economic and social situations. They learned from their students the promise and excitement of taking action. Many times this involved groups or certain students transcending what the coach thought was possible. Isaac thought

> It was meaningful to see sort of the students when they were either pressed into a corner or if I pressed them into a corner, emerge with probably statements and ideas that were beyond what they may have expected from themselves. I think I found it especially meaningful because you have the good students who will be there and will always sort of provide to the discussion and always or mostly be engaged. But then there's the students who sort of sit on the periphery and are either joking around or they're not taking it all that seriously, but every one in a while you'll press them and they'll come up with an idea that's so incredibly creative that it's stunning, in a way. And I find that to be extremely meaningful.

Fiona said that her students "taught me [about] the things that people can accomplish. Because, who would have thought that we could have pulled off a [multi-school] gathering in four weeks. And it could go so well." Others, such as Andrew, were inspired from specific breakthroughs as opposed to end accomplishments.

> It's the feeling of actually contributing and getting kids to think about issues, and, I had to dig a little deeper for my group too, cause they chose a topic at first that they didn't really like, because they had to choose a group. And at the half way point, it's like, alright what do you want to do, what pisses you off about this, what would you like to change? You know, do you like the ____ (unclear) people? Well, no. Well, what interests you? The war in Iraq. What do you think about it? We don't like it. Go on, I don't like it either. I would get excited, and to see, see kids get passionate about something that they want to change, that's dangerous. That's what's great.

On a simple level, coaches fed off the students' energy. On another level, coaches were pushed to rethink their ideas about the capacity, agency and power of young people. In many cases, working with their group invited coaches to re-think their ideas about politics and their own political engagement.

C. Learning about Political Action

Seeing young people's excitement, interest, and actual work on their political projects provoked the college students to re-think their own understanding of political action and their sense of themselves as political actors. At the same time, undergraduates also came away from their experience with a better understanding of the difficulties of public work. In the interviews, students were asked a series of questions about their understanding of politics, what the class / coaching experience have to do with political engagement, and how their thinking has changed as a result of the course. The interviews and reflections revealed three dominant ways how students came to **think about** politics differently.

First, almost all students commented on how participating in the class and Public Achievement deepened or extended their sense of themselves as political actors. As the survey and interviews revealed, students in the class already tended to be politically active. However, the act of "doing something" and/or working with kids who were doing something caused them to re-think their own sense of political engagement. Kelly's comment reflected many other students' views.

> And politics have always been a big part of my life, and that's [my] major now, its' really been cool. But, I've always thought about things like that. I've always studied it, and I've always been really interested in it, and now this class has kind of put me in the mind set that you know it's great to learn all these things, and you know discuss them and stuff like that, cause it's always been a big part of my family, especially. But sometimes you just gotta do something about it, sometimes you just, you know, you gotta go out there and do it myself...

The desire to be more politically active was reinforced bynot wanting to be hypocritical: coaches' could not encourage their group members to be active citizens without questioning the extent of their own involvement. Bob confirmed this, "I learned a lot about not being hypocritical. I tell them, oh when you grow up you need to be active, and then, [I need] figure

out ways that I can be active politically. And I've taken a lot of knowledge and responsibility in that." In some cases, coaches found a role-model for political engagement and as a source of political hope in their team's enthusiasm and action. When asked why coachingis meaningful, Clarissa answered,

> I'd say, it's given me a sense of hope that I lost for a while, cause it's really easy to become cynical, especially ... with the whole war and things going on, but it does definitely give you the idea that well at least people are trying to make a difference. And that's one [of] the best things that I see, like these are young people that are going to be working towards a future ...

Many other students mirrored Clarissa's views, finding inspiration in possibilities for citizen action from their young group members.

Second, the students also came away from the class with a better understanding of the challenges and difficulties of citizen political action. These difficulties involved working with young people, working through a school's administrative policies, and attempting to change a community that was sometimes indifferent. Helen thought that PA

> Demonstrated to me that my ideal is probably very separated from the reality of this type of work, public work, because you forget about the logistical issues of working with people. And that your passion does not necessarily translate into somebody else's passion. Even the understanding of what needs to be done is so incredibly different. That's just a reality-check portion of it. I think there's also the hopeful portion of it that PA has given to me. I think I would need to do it again to really know how I felt about it for sure.

The most frequent complaint from coaches was how hard it was to accomplish anything with young people who are apathetic or "don't care." Some worked tirelessly to excite members of their group. Others gave up on their team members, saying that coaching PA made them more cynical about the possibilities of citizen politics. A number of students attempted to learn why their group members were not excited about PA or their issue. They had conversations with their group about their everyday lives, in addition to their interests in the issue. Elaine had the realization that

> I have all these really lofty ideas like, before PA. I was like gosh, this is gonna be great, this is what I'm gonna do, and you know now, it doesn't work like that. I think I got a little does of reality, I mean like the fact that they have like a basketball game tonight is a million times more important than like they're role as active citizens. They're in Junior High; they're not expected to be thinking about democracy all the time. I forgot what it's like to be in junior high, I forgot about peer pressure, I forgot about external factors like that, I forgot about how much they have on their plate already, and they're preoccupied with so many other things right now. I think a lot of my kids signed up for public Achievement, cause it's kind of a time to relax and like hang out with their friend's kind of, it's not like, school time.

Derek was struck by the socio-economic conditions in which his students lived. He was surprised by that fact that many high school students in his group worked two jobs to support their families. He stated, "I think they've taught me, they've really shown me what real society is like."

Many students (6) identified the school as another source of difficulty, specifically how challenging it was to attempt to work democratically in a marginally democratic institution. Michael wrote in his thought book,

> I really think the school has its priorities elsewhere, or maybe it just doesn't understand what is needed, because sometimes I felt a little patronized. Like I was given a choice between identifying with my group or the adults in the school. That was unpleasant but instructive. I felt like I finally understood one of the major blockages in PA, the school itself.

Other coaches cited time limitations as a chief impediment to substantive political action. Given the democratic methods of PA, students felt that it took too long to get organized and start taking action. They felt that they ended up doing smaller projects just for the sake of doing them; not something that would make a real difference in the community.

For two coaches, the difficulties of working with young people in schools made them more cynical and disheartened about politics, youth, and political action. The quote that opened this paper recounts how Elaine came to be extremely critical of Public Achievement. Jasmine ended her experience feeling

> Unbelievably cynical about PA. Just not believing, not having a lot of faith in it. Simply because

> you're putting these [college students] out with two months training, having to read all these contradicting theories and then put into this school setting. What are they gonna do? Some people are ready for it but some people aren't. I know I wasn't. I know a lot of other coaches that weren't. And to try to instigate these kids into doing community things with such limits, and coming from the school, first of all. You've gotta break those barriers at school to be able to break anything in the community. But then again, the optimistic side of me comes in and says working in the school and working with what you have and working with a little knowledge that you derived from these theories, you still did it, you still survived.

While Jasmine had a difficult time the entire year, her experience was particularly colored by an incident with her students and the subsequent reaction of the school administration. Transcripts like this are difficult to read, but very instructive. In particular, this situation highlights the need for more careful reflection so that college students can process and make sense of difficult experiences without "turning off" from politics.

Third, students re-thought what politics means to them. Most often, they expanded their definition to include citizen action: a number of students (5) commented on how they now re-defined politics in terms of people taking action to solve public problems, in addition to issues of governance. They often related this new view of politics to the dynamics of their group and/or how their groups negotiated the politics of the school. Some took this notion of everyday politics and viewed it in terms of a "game," with rules but considerable leeway for citizens to "play" in solving problems. Fiona applied this redefinition to her everyday life, commenting,

> I think about citizenship more. Like what it means to be a citizen, and not [just] in the sense of politics, like I don't think about politics like what I'm gonna vote, or what the issues, but in the sense of, the world of politics. Like, we go to a restaurant and our service is bad or something like that, and I'm more likely to go talk to somebody about it, and say just so that people are aware of what's going on, and acting more like a citizen in that way. Like being more… I don't know what you call it, but just being more aware of what's going on in the world and how like my city runs. And my neighborhood, like thinking about myself not as me, but in a world, in a neighborhood, you know…

Fiona was not only thinking about citizenship more, and in different ways, she was able to articulate how she was living citizenship and practicing politics in her everyday life.

D. Narratives of Personal Change and Political Engagement

While students may have revised their understanding of politics, did their experiences in the course provoke them to change their behavior? This section details findings on the connections between learning, doing and becoming politically engaged. Recall that the interviews asked three sets of questions to assess personal change—whether students had "tried out" anything they had learned in other domains of their life, if students had politically participated in new or different ways, and if students saw themselves differently as political actors. Follow up questions were asked to determine the extent in which students were actually "living" these changes—that is, could they tell stories about the application of what they had learned in other domains of their lives. Students' responses ranged from small-scale changes (Fiona's speaking up about bad restaurant service) to larger changes in vocation and political action.

There were several coaches who talked about how they lived their everyday lives differently as a result of the class and coaching. This typically entailed using skills they learned in class and coaching in other parts of their lives. Jasmine and Kelly both found themselves evaluating with their co-workers and peers. The following exchange is illustrative.

Kelly:	I do ask a lot more questions of people, you know, why are we doing this, what does this gain us? It's more of an evaluation type. Especially living in a fraternity, you do stuff just because the older guys taught you to do that. Is this really the best way to do it? But yeah, I think that's a part that I have taken on, is that evaluation type.
Interviewer:	Ok, so what did you learn, in trying on this new way of being, this evaluation person?
Kelly:	What'd I learn?
Interviewer:	Yeah, alright, let me see if I got it. You took the way of evaluation, or the way that evaluation is done at PA, as coach and [in] Roudy's class, and you've taken those ways of doing things and brought those lets say to your fraternity, if I heard it right. And you tried it there. You've done it now for a bit, now, maybe,

Kelly: Yeah, a couple months.

Interviewer: And you look back on that, did trying it out at your fraternity teach you anything?

Kelly: Yeah, it's something that I knew but never really realized, people are very happy with the status quo. And, until you bring a [to] light that maybe some other way is better, or that change is out there, it's probably just going to keep on going, the status quo, and until somebody shakes it up a little bit and asks, like why are we doing it this way? But you know, you gotta question things sometimes, why do we always do it the same way all the time. I guess that's something that I've learned to do, is to question, question things a lot more, instead of just taking somebody, something that's someone reads in a book or writes in a book or says on the news, and taking that as factual.

In my analysis, Kelly's last answer demonstrates the fluid transfer of skills and attitudes from his class experience to the context of his fraternity. Moreover, taking on evaluation as a social role and practice has political implications. Kelly's sentiment that you "gotta question things sometimes" could be interpreted in terms of finding one's vocation. Instead of blindly accepting existing practices and traditions, Kelly was compelled to question. Moreover, this act of questioning was not solely individual; in trying to involve other fraternity members in his act of questioning took on public dimensions .

In addition to evaluation, students told us about a host of other skills that they had tried out in other domains of their lives. Many undergraduates told how they were trying to develop their abilities to ask better questions. Clarissa told a story about how she interacts differently with her father. Before the course, she and her dad tended to "butt heads a lot" because they had very different political views. Now, she reports using questions to "get my point across, instead of just going up against him." In addition, she and others shared how they pay closer attention to the "teachable moments" in everyday group interactions, and use questions to capture the learning potential of these moments with their friends. Related, several students (5) commented how they interact in group settings differently, paying attention to group dynamics, and working differently to help organize people to work together. Many (6) told stories about how they talk

about politics, education, and democracy more with their friends and peers (who are often unsympathetic interlocutors). By themselves, these small practices and new skills may not immediately strike us as political engagement. However, these practices take on political significance when framed in a language of political engagement.

There were a few students (3) who offered narratives about changing involvement in politics. Derek commented on how the class and PA "lowered his threshold for involvement in politics." He commented

> Well, as far as action, like I consider myself an active person before, but there was kind of a threshold like, like I had to feel X amount of emotion about an issue, or I had to have X amount of time before I'd acted publicly on that issue, and that threshold is lower now. I don't know how much lower, but it's lower. It's like, when they had the protest in DC about the war, I thought to myself, maybe I should drive out there and go to it. And, I know a year ago, like the cost of driving out there, would have exceeded my threshold of doing it. But now, it didn't and I actually went and did it, and it was great.

But equally as important as driving to the rally, Derek re-thought his assumptions about activism. Before this experience, he saw people who weren't active as lazy, now he has an understanding how competing interests the preclude engagement (especially poverty). This has led him to consider how his own activism is a product of privilege.

Bob was also highly engaged in political and civic activities, serving in student government, on University committees, and completing an internship with the governor's office. Through his experience in Public Achievement, he reports paying more attention to the institutional practices of these groups, specifically how meetings are run in ways that foster or preclude democratic participation. Bob reports taking responsibility to include more voices in meetings he participates in. Bob also took his political involvementoutside of institutional settings. He is actively exploring how he can work to encourage college students at the University of Minnesota and other campuses to vote. After researching existing organizations,

he decided to create a new organization to coordinate resources to mobilize voter turnout among young people.

Fiona not only became more politically involved, but she reconceived how she saw herself as a citizen. Unique to this class, she had already had several experiences in PA-- she coached PA as part of the Metro Urban Studies Term program and was an intern for the Center for Democracy and Citizenship. In other words, she was immersed in the philosophy and practice of PA, and had chosen a variety of different political engagement experiences in college. However, she did not describe herself as an activist. She also talked about how she was not involved in politics before these experiences. In her interviews and journals, she related stories about living as a citizen in her everyday life and becoming more active in formal politics. Fiona's concept of citizenship stretches from speaking up in restaurants, to deliberately meeting her neighbors, to becoming a more informed voter (she reported voting in local elections for the first time). Asked if she sees herself differently as a civic or political actor, Fiona replied,

> I definitely have, I know. That the whole PA framework, and way of thinking about the world has definitely changed how I think about the world now. Like I see myself as an active player in the world now, and somebody who can make a difference, and who's gonna try, at least, like be active. Like, I always want to talk about stuff all the time, and they're like, [coach name], we don't need to be talking about this right now, you know we'll be at the bar drinking, or whatever, and I'll bring up all these issues, [about] politics and then democracy, and then like everything I bring up, now. And they don't want to talk about it very much, but some of my friends do...

While Fiona was certainly inspired by Public Achievement she was still able to critically assess how the program was implemented.[5] Based on the interviews and her journal, it is likely that the course reinforced her on-going change in political engagement, in combination with her other experiences. These three stories of personal change are striking. Each attributes changes in political behavior, attitudes, identity to their experiences in the course and Public Achievement. Yet, by closely listening to students experiences outside the course, the causal links between

experience and involvement become more complicated. What is clear is that Public Achievement deepened the quality of their already on-going political involvement.

V. Discussion

As a whole, the four areas of findings represent the significant, and sometimes profound, learning experiences that occurred in the class and in Public Achievement. They show what the experience of being in a democratic classroom and coaching Public Achievement look like, as well as detail what students learned about politics and how they changed as political actors. But what are the implications of these findings? What do they teach us about democratic education and political engagement? In what ways can they be used to improve current practice? I argue that the findings can be used to develop a grounded theory of democratic education and political engagement (Strauss and Corbin 1990). In the following discussion, I will offer the first tentative steps in this theory building.

The findings point towards a pedagogy of democratic education. Students understood themselves as living what they were learning. This integration of living learning called students to "step outside the box," to experience the role of 'student' in new and different ways. Being in a democratic classroom, and having the ability to change how the class was taught, made typical practices of being a student more explicit, and thus, more permeable to revision. In addition, the experience of coaching Public Achievement put students in a related situation to the class, but in a different role. Facilitating learning experiences for young people called students to reflect on their own educational experiences, and make their own pedagogical decisions. This nested experience of teaching and learning provided significant learning opportunities for students, but I also question whether being in a democratic classroom unrealistically raised students

expectations about being a coach in Public Achievement. In either case, shifting roles, positions and responsibilities gave students an awareness of themselves and their actions in the moment, prompting reflection on who they were, what they had learned, and how they should engage with young people.

These difficulties, however rich, lead to one of the most important lessons for practice— students need to be supported and have adequate time to reflect on such difficult experiences. Guided reflection enables students to place themselves and their actions within a conceptual frame: to develop new ideas, see their experience in context and think through the impact of their learning for other domains of their everyday life. But more importantly, these findings suggest that I did not adequately reflect with students on the political dimensions of their experiences—they saw themselves as learning about themselves as students more than learning about themselves as citizens.

While the findings point to pedagogy, they also leave us with an important question: what do these learning experiences tell us about how students become politically engaged? There is considerable evidence that students learned important civic and political (as well as social) skills through coaching and class. It is also evident that they now think differently **about** politics and themselves as public actors. What is not as clear is whether this experience encouraged students to actually change their behavior. Only three students told stories of significant personal change, and they were already civically and politically active before the course. What about the other students in the class, who detailed rich learning experiences, but not necessarily stories of significant political change? These students often spoke of transferring the skills learned through their Public Achievement experience to other domains of their lives. While they recognized transferring these skills, many students did not use those skills for political purposes or frame

their actions in terms of political action. In fact, when many students were asked whether what they were doing was political engagement, they did not mention these stories of transferring skills in their answers. Nonetheless, I assert that the stories of Clarissa not arguing with her father and Kelly evaluating with his fraternity are significant in thinking about political engagement. Most importantly, they show how political qualities and skills can be "lived" in everyday life. It may be unrealistic to expect a leap from coaching PA to being a political activist, especially in this short time frame. The transfer of political skills may serve as an intermediate step on the path towards political engagement. As such it may bridge the divide that so many youth feel between the world of politics and their lives. If anything, we need to make this political learning, often small, hidden and unnamed, a more explicit, visible and relevant part of our work to engage students in political action.

NOTES

1. All names used are pseudonyms. I would like to thank James Farr for giving me the opportunity to teach this course as well as years of advice and guidance. Ross Velure-Roholt and Michael Baizerman not only conducted the interviews, but helped with data analysis and far reaching conversations about the nature of democratic education. The Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching provided the funds that made it possible to conduct this study.

2. I emphasized the importance of theory in practice, as opposed to applied to practice (see Schön 1983).

3.While the discussion of "what is a democratic classroom?" is outside the confines of this paper, I did explain to students that only certain aspects would be opened up to collective decision-making in order to both model democratic educational practice as well as make explicit the learning that comes through democratic practices (see Cuoto, 1998; Mattern 1997)

4. Public work is a contested concept. The idea of public work draws on and resonates with traditions of civic action, political struggles for emancipation, and foundational theories of citizenship and democracy in American history (Boyte and Kari 1996; Evans and Boyte 1986).

5.My assessment is that students' papers improved from the first to the final assignment.

6. See Cruikshank 2000 for a discussion of the ideological dimensions to citizen based politics.

REFERENCES

Barber, Benjamin. 1984. *Strong Democracy: Participatory Politics for a New Age.* Berkeley: University of California Press.

Cruikshank, Barbara. 1999. *The Will to Empower: Democratic Citizens and Other Subjects.* Ithaca: Cornell University Press.

Billig, Shelley. 2000. "Research on K-12 School-Based Service-Learning: The Evidence Builds." *Phi Delta Kappan* 81(9): 658-664.

Boyte, Harry. 1991. "Community Service and Civic Education." *Phi Delta Kappan* 72(10): 765-767.

---------. and James Farr. 1997. "The Work of Citizenship and the Problem of Service-Learning." In *Educating Citizenship: Concepts and Models for Service Learning in Political Science,* ed. Richard M Battistoni, and William E. Hudson. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

---------. and Nancy Kari. 1996. *Building America: The Democratic Promise of Public Work.* Philadelphia: Temple University Press.

Clandinin, D. Jean and F. Michael. Connelly. 2000. *Narrative Inquiry: Experience and Story in Qualitative Research.* San Franciso: Jossey Bass.

Cuoto, Richard. 1998. "The Art of Teaching Democracy." *Change* 30 (2): 34-39.

Dewey, John. 1916. *Democracy and Education.* New York: Free Press. Internally referenced as *DE.*

---------. 1997. *Experience and Education.* New York: Touchstone. Internally referenced as *EE.*

Evans, Sara, and Harry Boyte. 1986. *Free Spaces: The Sources of Democratic Change in America.* New York: Harper & Row.

Farr, James. 1997. "Political Theory." in *Educating Citizenship: Concepts and Models for Service Learning in Political Science,* ed. Richard M Battistoni, and William E. Hudson. Washington, DC: American Association of Higher Education.

Geertz, Clifford. 1971. *The Interpretation of Cultures.* New York: Basic Books.

Giles, Dwight and Janet Eyler. 1994. "The Theoretical Roots of Service-Learning in John Dewey: Toward a Theory of Service-Learning." *Michigan Journal of Community Service Learning* 1(1): 77-85.

---------. 1997. *Where's the Learning in Service-learning?* San Francisco: Jossey-Bass

Hildreth, R.W. 1998. *Building Worlds, Transforming Lives, Making History: A Guide to Public Achievement.* Minneapolis, MN: Center for Democracy and Citizenship.

---------. 2000. "Theorizing Citizenship and Evaluating Public Achievement." *PS: Political Science and Politics.* 33 (3): 627-633.

Hepburn, Mary. 2000. "Service Learning and Civic Education in the Schools: What Does Recent Research Tell Us?" In *Education for Civic Engagement in Democracy,* eds. Sheilah Mann and John J. Patrick. Bloomington: ERIC.

Keeter, Scott, C. Zufkin, M. Andolina, and K. Jenkins. 2002. "The Civic and Political Health of a Nation: A Generational Portrait." CIRCLE. Retrieved from the World Wide Web on January 3, 2003. http://www.puaf.umd.edu/CIRCLE/research/products/Civic_and_Political_Health.pdf

Markus, G., J. Howard, and D. King. 1993. "Integrating Community Service and Classroom Instruction Enhances Learning: Results from an Experiment." *Educational Evaluation and Policy Analysis* 15 (Winter): 410-419.

Mattern, Mark 1997. "Teaching Democratic Theory Democratically." *PS: Political Science & Politics* 30 (3): 510-516.

Niemi, Richard G. and Jane Junn. 1998. *Civic Education: What Makes Students Learn.* New Haven : Yale University Press.

Patrick, John J. 2000. "Introduction." In *Education for Civic Engagement in Democracy,* eds. Sheilah Mann and John J. Patrick. Bloomington: ERIC.

Polkinghorne, Donald E. 1988. *Narrative Knowing and the Human Sciences.* Albany, NY: SUNY Press.

Schön, Donald A. 1983. *The Reflective Practitioner : How Professionals Think in Action.* New York : Basic Books.

Stewart, David and Algis Mickunas. 1990 [1974]. *Exploring Phenomenology: A Guide to the Field and Its Literature.* Athens, Oh.: Ohio University Press.

Strauss, Anselm and Juliet Corbin. 1990. *Basics of Qualitative Research: Grounded Theory Procedures and Techniques.* Newbury Park, CA: Sage.

Van Manen, Max.1990. *Researching Lived Experience: Human Science for an Action Sensitive Pedagogy.* Albany: State University of New York Press.

Waterman, Alan S., ed. 1997. *Service-Learning: Applications from the Research.* London: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.

U.S. Department of Education
Office of Educational Research and Improvement (OERI)
National Library of Education (NLE)
Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC)

REPRODUCTION RELEASE

(Specific Document)

SO 035290

I. DOCUMENT IDENTIFICATION:

Title: The Lived Experience of Political Engagement	
Author(s): Roudy W. Hildreth	
Corporate Source:	Publication Date: 2003

II. REPRODUCTION RELEASE:

In order to disseminate as widely as possible timely and significant materials of interest to the educational community, documents announced in the monthly abstract journal of the ERIC system, *Resources in Education* (RIE), are usually made available to users in microfiche, reproduced paper copy, and electronic media, and sold through the ERIC Document Reproduction Service (EDRS). Credit is given to the source of each document, and, if reproduction release is granted, one of the following notices is affixed to the document.

If permission is granted to reproduce and disseminate the identified document, please CHECK ONE of the following three options and sign at the bottom of the page.

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 1 documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

1

Level 1

☑

Check here for Level 1 release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche or other ERIC archival media (e.g., electronic) and paper copy

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2A documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE, AND IN ELECTRONIC MEDIA FOR ERIC COLLECTION SUBSCRIBERS ONLY, HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2A

Level 2A

☐

Check here for Level 2A release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche and in electronic media for ERIC archival collection subscribers only

The sample sticker shown below will be affixed to all Level 2B documents

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL IN MICROFICHE ONLY HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

Sample

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

2B

Level 2B

☐

Check here for Level 2B release, permitting reproduction and dissemination in microfiche only

Documents will be processed as indicated provided reproduction quality permits.
If permission to reproduce is granted, but no box is checked, documents will be processed at Level 1.

I hereby grant to the Educational Resources Information Center (ERIC) nonexclusive permission to reproduce and disseminate this document as indicated above. Reproduction from the ERIC microfiche or electronic media by persons other than ERIC employees and its system contractors requires permission from the copyright holder. Exception is made for non-profit reproduction by libraries and other service agencies to satisfy information needs of educators in response to discrete inquiries.

Sign here, please

Signature: R W Hildreth	Printed Name/Position/Title: R.W. HILDRETH
Organization/Address: 1414 Social Science Building 267 19th Ave South MPLS MN 55455	Telephone: 612-624-4144 FAX:
	E-Mail Address: HILDRETH@POLISCI.UMN.EDU Date: 9/24/03

(Over)

III. DOCUMENT AVAILABILITY INFORMATION (FROM NON-ERIC SOURCE):

If permission to reproduce is not granted to ERIC, *or*, if you wish ERIC to cite the availability of the document from another source, please provide the following information regarding the availability of the document. (ERIC will not announce a document unless it is publicly available, and a dependable source can be specified. Contributors should also be aware that ERIC selection criteria are significantly more stringent for documents that cannot be made available through EDRS.)

Publisher/Distributor:
Address:
Price:

IV. REFERRAL OF ERIC TO COPYRIGHT/REPRODUCTION RIGHTS HOLDER:

If the right to grant this reproduction release is held by someone other than the addressee, please provide the appropriate name and address:

Name:
Address:

V. WHERE TO SEND THIS FORM:

Send this form to the following ERIC Clearinghouse:

ERIC/CHESS
2805 E. Tenth Street, #120
Bloomington, IN 47408

However, if solicited by the ERIC Facility, or if making an unsolicited contribution to ERIC, return this form (and the document being contributed) to:

ERIC Processing and Reference Facility
4483-A Forbes Boulevard
Lanham, Maryland 20706

Telephone: 301-552-4200
Toll Free: 800-799-3742
FAX: 301-552-4700
e-mail: ericfac@inet.ed.gov
WWW: http://ericfacility.org

EFF-088 (Rev. 2/2001)